

1 REMARKS

2 Status of the Claims

3 Claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-23 are pending in the application, Claims 6 and 14 having
4 previously been canceled, Claims 1, 4, 13, 15 and 22 having been amended to more clearly
5 distinguish the claimed subject matter over the cited art.

6 Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

7 Claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable
8 over Borland in view of U.S. Patent RE No. 36,704, filed 11/16/1995, issued 5/16/2000 (Parker et al.,
9 hereinafter referred to as "Parker"). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection for the
10 following reasons.

11 In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this
12 response, the following discussion focuses on independent Claims 1, 13, and 22. The patentability of
13 each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, applicants'
14 decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be
15 considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's conclusion that these dependent
16 claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly, applicants' decision not
17 to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment made by the
18 Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's
19 interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed, applicants believe that all of the dependent
20 claims are patentable over the cited references. Moreover, a specific traverse of the rejection of each
21 dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as
22 the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

23 Patentability of Independent Claim 1

24 Significant differences exist between the claim recitation and the cited art because the cited
25 art does NOT teach or suggest applicants' recitation in Claim 1 of "*a format set that includes an*
26 *associated identifier descriptive of the font theme and the color scheme.*" Applicants' first step (as
27 amended) recites:

28 determining a sample of formats comprising a plurality of formats from a format set,
29 the format set including at least one font set and at least one color set, each font set
30 including a plurality of fonts defining a font theme *and each color set including a*
plurality of colors defining a color scheme, wherein the format set includes an
associated identifier descriptive of the font theme and the color scheme, and wherein

1 each of the formats from the plurality of formats includes a format font name, a format
2 font color, and a format font size; (Emphasis added.)

3 An example of the added recitation provided by the amendment to Claim 1, with respect to an
4 associated identifier being descriptive of the font theme and the color scheme, is shown in
5 FIGURE 1A. Notice that format gallery 102 indicates that the selected font set 104 is “Curly-Q” and
6 the selected color set 106 is “Ocean,” and thus, the selected format set is referred to as “Curly-Q
7 Ocean.” (See applicants’ specification, page 6, lines 23-26.)

8 In contrast to applicants’ claim recitation, Boland does NOT teach or suggest a format set that
9 includes an associated identifier descriptive of the font theme and the color scheme. Under the
10 section of the Office Action entitled, “Response to Arguments,” the Examiner asserts that the features
11 of a format name and a format set that is different from Borland’s Style format set are not recited in
12 the rejected claims (Office Action, page 9). The Examiner also asserts that Borland’s figure on
13 page 60 also discloses a font theme, because various styles are shown in the “Styles” list box and the
14 naming of various styles with theme related names is shown (i.e., “List Number,” “List Number 2,”
15 and “List Number 3). *Id.* However, applicants’ recitation for the first step in Claim 1 has been
16 clarified to indicate that the associated identifier is descriptive of **both** the font theme and the color
17 scheme. There is no indication in Borland’s figure on page 60 that the various styles shown in the
18 “Styles” list box include an associated identifier related to the color scheme.

19 Parker fails to cure Borland’s deficiencies. The Examiner has also asserted that Parker
20 teaches the simultaneous display of text portions for comparison by a user in Figure 6a at reference
21 sign 610 (Office Action, page 4). But notice that Figure 6a of Parker is directed to a “Font Inspector”
22 display and thus fails to teach a format set that includes an associated identifier descriptive of the font
23 theme *and the color scheme*.

24 Thus, Borland fails to teach all of the elements recited in independent Claim 1. Parker fails to
25 correct the deficiencies of Borland in disclosing or suggesting the recitation of Claim 1. Accordingly,
26 the rejection of Claim 1 over these references should be withdrawn.

27 Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent
28 claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend and because Borland in view of Parker
29 does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 1, the rejection of dependent
30 Claims 2-5 and 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Borland and further in view of Parker should be

1 withdrawn for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with the rejection of
2 Claim 1.

3 Patentability of Independent Claim 13

4 Independent Claim 13 is directed towards a system for reformatting a previously formatted
5 portion of document text. The Examiner has rejected this claim under the same rationale as provided
6 in his rejection of Claims 1 and 3. As amended, since functions are included in this claim that are
7 generally similar to the steps of independent Claim 1, for reasons similar to those presented above in
8 connection with applicants' traverse of the rejection of independent Claim 1, independent Claim 13
9 also distinguishes over Borland and Parker, because the cited art does not teach or suggest a format
10 set that includes an associated identifier descriptive of the font theme and the color scheme.
11 Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Borland and
12 further in view of Parker should be withdrawn for the reasons given above.

13 Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent
14 claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend and because Borland in view of Parker
15 does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 13, the rejection of dependent
16 Claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Borland and further in view of Parker should be
17 withdrawn for at least the same reasons as the rejection of Claim 13.

18 Patentability of Independent Claim 22

19 Independent Claim 22 is directed towards a user interface for reformatting a previously
20 formatted portion of document text. The Examiner has rejected this claim under the same rationale as
21 his rejection of Claims 1 and 13. As amended, since the first step recites functions generally similar
22 to the steps of independent Claim 1, for reasons similar to those presented above in connection with
23 applicants' traverse of the rejection of independent Claim 1, independent Claim 22 also distinguishes
24 over Borland and Parker, because the cited art does not teach or suggest a format set that includes an
25 associated identifier descriptive of the font theme and the color scheme. Accordingly, the rejection
26 of independent Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Borland and further in view of Parker
27 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above.

28 Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent
29 claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend and because Borland in view of Parker
30 does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 22, the rejection of dependent

1 Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Borland and further in view of Parker should be withdrawn
2 for at least the same reasons as the rejection of Claim 22.

3 In view of the amendments and Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims in
4 this application define a novel and non-obvious invention, and that the application is in condition for
5 allowance and should be passed to issue without further delay. Should any further questions remain,
6 the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

7
8 Respectfully submitted,

9
10
11 /sabrina k. macintyre/
12 Sabrina K. MacIntyre
13 Registration No. 56,912

14 SKM/RMA:elm
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30